



DRAFT
PROBLEM FORMULATION FOR ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT AT
OPERABLE UNIT 3
LIBBY ASBESTOS SUPERFUND SITE



February 11, 2008

Prepared by:
US Environmental Protection Agency
Region 8
Denver, CO



With Technical Assistance from:
Syracuse Research Corporation
Denver, CO



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	8
2.0	SITE CHARACTERIZATION.....	9
2.1	Site Location	9
2.2	Physical Setting.....	9
2.3	Ecological Setting	13
2.3.1	Terrestrial Habitats and Plant Species	13
2.3.2	Aquatic Species.....	14
2.3.3	Wildlife Species on or Near the Libby OU3 Site	15
2.3.4	Federal and State Species of Special Concern	15
2.4	Summary of Data Available from Phase I	15
2.4.1	Asbestos	15
2.4.2	Non-Asbestos Contaminants.....	18
3.0	CONCEPTUAL SITE MODELS	20
3.1	Potential Sources of Contamination.....	20
3.2	Migration Pathways in the Environment	21
3.3	Potentially Exposed Ecological Receptors	21
3.4	Exposure Pathways of Chief Concern	24
4.0	MANAGEMENT GOALS AND ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES	26
4.1	Management Goals	26
4.2	Definition of Population	26
4.3	Assessment Endpoints	27
4.4	Measurement Endpoints.....	27
5.0	ASSESSMENT OF RISKS FROM NON-ASBESTOS CONTAMINANTS	31
5.1	Assessment Strategy	31
5.2	Initial Screen Results Based on Phase I Data	32
6.0	ASSESSMENT OF RISKS FROM ASBESTOS	34
6.1	Overview of Asbestos	34
6.2	Assessment Strategy	35
6.2.1	Strategy for Assessing Risks to Aquatic Receptors	36
6.2.2	Strategy for Assessing Risks to Terrestrial Plants and Soil Invertebrates	38
6.2.3	Strategy for Assessing Risks to Terrestrial Birds and Mammals	39
6.2.4	Strategy for Assessing Risks to Amphibians	43
7.0	REFERENCES	44

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Eight Step Process Recommended in Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund (ERAGs) (USEPA, 1997)
Figure 2-1	Operable Unit 3 Libby, Montana
Figure 2-2	Land Ownership
Figure 2-3	Measured Wind Data From The Meteorological Station At The Mine
Figure 2-4	Rainy Creek Watershed
Figure 2-5	Mined Area Features
Figure 2-6	Land Cover
Figure 2-7	Vegetative Land Cover within OU3 Area
Figure 2-8	Photographs of Aquatic Habitats within OU3 Area
Figure 3-1	Historic Surface Water Sample Locations (1981 - 1994)
Figure 3-2	Phase I Surface Water and Sediment Sample Locations
Figure 3-3	Phase IIA Sampling Locations in Rainy Creek Watershed
Figure 3-4	Mine Waste and Soil Sample Locations
Figure 3-5	Conceptual Site Model for Ecological Exposure to Non-Asbestos Contaminants
Figure 3-6	USGS Gauging Stations on Streams Similar to Rainy Creek Drainage
Figure 3-7	Conceptual Approach for Classifying Risks based on Hazard Quotients (HQs)
Figure 3-8	Screening Hazard Quotient Values for Chromium in Sediment
Figure 3-9	Flowchart of Approach for Rapid Bioassessment Protocol (RBP) III
Figure 3-10	Biological Condition of Benthic Macroinvertebrate Communities and Sampling Stations in Strawberry Creek versus Habitat Quality
Figure 3-11	Total Extractable Hydrocarbon (TEH) Levels in Sediments
Figure 4-1	Vermiculite and Amphibole Asbestos
Figure 4-2	Asbestos Levels in Surface Water
Figure 4-3	Historic Sediment Sample Locations
Figure 4-4	Asbestos Levels in Sediment
Figure 4-5	Historic Soil Sample Locations
Figure 4-6	Historic Tree Bark Sample Locations
Figure 4-7	Soil/Tree Bark Sampling Locations
Figure 4-8	Asbestos Concentrations in Forest Soil
Figure 4-9	Air Monitoring Locations

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1	Climate Data for Libby NE Ranger Station (245015)
Table 2-2	Stream Use Classifications
Table 2-3	The Classification System Used to Map Montana's Existing Vegetation and Land Cover
Table 2-4	Aquatic Invertebrate Species Collected from EMAP Sampling Location in Kootenai River (August 2002)
Table 2-5	Fish Species Collected from EMAP Sampling Location in Kootenai River (August 2002)
Table 3-1	Non-Asbestos Results for Surface Water Samples Collected in 2001
Table 3-2	Analytical Methods for Surface Water
Table 3-3	List of Surface Water Stations and Analyses
Table 3-4	Non-Asbestos Results for Surface Water
Table 3-5	Summary of Water Quality Parameters by Sampling Location
Table 3-6	Surface Water Flow Record by Sampling Location
Table 3-7	Analytical Methods for Sediment
Table 3-8	List of Sediment Stations and Analyses
Table 3-9	Non-Asbestos Results for Sediment
Table 3-10	Analytical Methods for Mine Waste and Soil
Table 3-11	List of Mine Waste and Soil Stations and Analyses
Table 3-12	Non-Asbestos Results for Mine Wastes and Soil
Table 3-13	Phase I Non-Asbestos Results for Detected Analytes in Sediment by Station
Table 4-1	Analytical Methods for Asbestos
Table 4-2	Surface Water Asbestos Results Prior to Phase I (2001 - 2003)
Table 4-3	Phase I Asbestos Results for Surface Water
Table 4-4	Sediment Asbestos Results Prior to Phase I (2001)
Table 4-5	Phase I Asbestos Results for Sediment
Table 4-6	Asbestos Results for Soil Samples within Libby OU3 Prior to Phase I
Table 4-7	Phase I Asbestos Results for Mine Waste and Soils
Table 4-8	Asbestos Data from Tree Bark
Table 4-9	Phase I Asbestos Results for Forest Soil
Table 4-10	Ambient Air Field Results

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A	Species Potentially Inhabiting the Libby OU3 Site Area
Attachment B	Analytical Results of Phase I Sampling – Raw Data
Attachment C	Toxicity Screening Benchmarks – Non-Asbestos Contaminants
Attachment D	Toxicity data for Asbestos and Ecological Receptors

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AHERA	Asbestos Hazardous Emergency Response Act
BTAG	Biological Technical Assistance Group
BTEX	Benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, and xylenes
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CCV	Continuing Calibration Verification
CSF	Close Support Facility
cfs	cubic feet per second
COC	Chain of Custody
CSM	Conceptual Site Model
DO	Dissolved Oxygen
DQO	Data Quality Objective
EDD	Electronic Data Deliverable
EDXA	Energy Dispersive X-Ray Analysis
EMAP	Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPH	Extractable Petroleum Hydrocarbons
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
FS	Feasibility Study
FSDS	Field Sample Data Sheets
FSP	Field Sampling Plan
FTP	File Transfer Protocol
GC/MS	Gas chromatography/mass spectroscopy
GO	Grid opening
HASP	Health and Safety Plan
ICV	Initial Calibration Verification
ID	Identification
IL	Inter-laboratory
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
IS	Internal Standard
LA	Libby Amphibole
LCS	Laboratory Control Sample
LCSD	Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
MDEQ	Montana Department of Environmental Quality
MS	Matrix Spike
MSD	Matrix Spike Duplicate
MTBE	Methyl tert-butyl ether
NVLAP	National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OU	Operable Unit
PDF	Portable Document Format
PE	Performance Evaluation
PLM	Polarized Light Microscopy

LIST OF ACRONYMS (cont.)

PLM-VE	Polarized Light Microscopy Visual Area Estimation Method
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
PR	Percent Recovery
QA	Quality Assurance
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
QATS	Quality Assurance Technical Support
QC	Quality Control
RD	Recount Different
RF	Response Factors
RI	Remedial Investigation
RPD	Relative Percent Difference
RPM	Remedial Project Manager
RS	Recount Same
RSD	Relative Standard Deviation
SAED	Selective Area Electron Diffraction
SAP	Sampling and Analysis Plan
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SPP	Soil Preparation Plan
TAL	Target Analyte List
TCL	Target Compound List
TEH	Total Extractable Hydrocarbons
TEM	Transmission Electron Microscopy
TWF	Time-Weighting Factor
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
VPH	Volatile Petroleum Hydrocarbons

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document is an initial Problem Formulation for the ecological risk assessment (ERA) that will be performed for Operable Unit 3 (OU3) of the Libby Asbestos Superfund Site located near Libby, Montana.

Problem formulation is a systematic planning step that identifies the major concerns and issues to be considered in an ERA, and describes the basic approaches that will be used to characterize ecological risks that may exist (USEPA 1997). As discussed in USEPA (1997), problem formulation is generally an iterative process, undergoing refinement as new information and findings become available (Figure 1-1).

The first step in the ecological problem formulation is the review of available information on the nature of the site and the ecological setting, the nature of the contaminants that may be present in environmental media, and the types of ecological organisms that may come into contact with contaminated media. This information is summarized in Section 2 of this document.

The next step is to utilize the information that is available to develop one or more Conceptual Site Models (CSMs), which summarize the understanding of contaminant sources, fate and transport pathways, and exposure pathways that are potentially relevant for each group of ecological receptors. This information is presented in Section 3 of this document. As noted above, the CSM may be refined in an iterative process as new information becomes available.

The next step in problem formulation is to identify the risk management objectives at the site, and to select approaches for assessing whether those objectives are achieved or not. Section 4 of this document presents the risk management goals for the site, and reviews the general strategies that are available to assess risks to ecological receptors.

Section 5 presents a description of the specific strategy that will be followed to evaluate risks to ecological receptors from non-asbestos contaminants that may be present at the site. Section 6 presents a detailed evaluation of the specific strategy that will be followed for evaluating ecological risks from asbestos.

2.0 SITE CHARACTERIZATION

2.1 Site Location

Libby is a community in northwestern Montana that is located near a large open-pit vermiculite mine. The mine location and preliminary study area boundary of Operable Unit (OU) 3 are shown in Figure 2-1. EPA established this preliminary study area boundary for the purpose of planning and developing the initial scope of the RI/FS for OU3. This preliminary boundary may be revised as results from the RI clarify the extent of environmental contamination associated with releases that may have occurred from the mine site.

2.2 Physical Setting

Land Use

The terrain in OU3 is mainly mountainous with dense forests and steep slopes. Current land ownership in the area is shown in Figure 2-2. Kootenai Development Corporation (KDC), a subsidiary of W.R Grace & Co., owns the mine area and the immediately adjacent portion of the off-mine area. The majority of the surrounding land is owned by the United States government and is managed by the Forest Service, with some land parcels owned by the State of Montana and some owned by Plum Creek Timberlands LP for commercial logging.

Climate

Northern Montana has a climate characterized by relatively hot summers, cold winters, and low precipitation. Table 2-1 presents climate data collected at the Libby NE Ranger Station, which is located just west of the town of Libby near the Kootenai River. Average summer high temperatures (°F) are in the upper 80s, and low temperatures are in the 40s, while winter highs are in the 30s and lows are in the teens. The western mountain ranges cause Pacific storms to drop much of their moisture before they reach the area, resulting in relatively low precipitation, averaging about 18 inches per year. The most abundant rainfall occurs in late spring/early summer. In the winter months, snowfall averages 54 inches each year and snow cover typically remains on the ground from November through March. Data collected from a weather station at the mine site indicate that winds are predominantly to the northeast (Figure 2-3).

Surface Water Features

The mine is located within the Rainy Creek watershed, which includes Rainy Creek, Carney Creek and Fleetwood Creek (Figure 2-4). The area drained is approximately 17.8 square miles.

Rainy Creek

Rainy Creek originates between Blue Mountain and the north fork of Jackson Creek at an elevation of about 5,000 feet, and falls to an elevation of 2,080 feet at the confluence with the Kootenai River (Zinner 1982). The average gradient for Rainy Creek is about 12% (Parker and Hudson 1992), and the banks are well vegetated (MNG 2008).

Fleetwood and Carney Creeks

Fleetwood Creek and Carney Creek are tributaries to Rainy Creek (Figure 2-4). The average stream gradient for Fleetwood Creek is about 11% (Parker and Hudson, 1992). Under current site conditions, Fleetwood Creek flows through a portion of mine waste before flowing into a large tailings impoundment which was constructed within the former Rainy Creek channel (see below). A ponded area was identified along Fleetwood Creek during reconnaissance surveys by EPA in 2007. This area is devoid of vegetation (Figure 2-8).

Carney Creek flows along and through mine waste on the south side of the mined area before joining Rainy Creek. During an aerial survey in 2008, a small pond was discovered on Carney Creek (Figure 2-8). This pond was formed when waste piles were deposited in the drainage and blocked and altered the flow of the creek. The pond is vegetated on one side. Several small springs are reported along Carney Creek (Zinner, 1982) and were identified during reconnaissance surveys by EPA in 2007 (Figure 2-8).

Tailings Impoundment

In 1972, W.R. Grace & Co. constructed a tailings impoundment that received the discharge of process waters that had previously been directly discharged to Rainy Creek. The impoundment was built to provide for settlement of the fine tails produce by the new (wet) process and to recover water for reuse. The height of the dam which forms the impoundment is about 135 feet measured from the downstream toe. The impoundment occupies 70 acres (Figure 2-5).

The impoundment receives input from both upper Rainy Creek and Fleetwood Creek (Figure 2-4). Existing outlets from the impoundment consist of a **decant tower and a chute spillway constructed of half-sections of 8 foot diameter corrugated metal pipe.** **[I never heard of this....are you sure it exists? where does this drain to?]** Normal flows from Rainy Creek are diverted around the impoundment through a pipe constructed of 48 and 52 inch diameter sections, re-entering the original channel approximately 800 feet downstream of the dam (Parker and Hudson 1992). **[we think this is not correct]** The impoundment also drains through a toe drain directly into Rainy Creek (http://epw.senate.gov/107th/sim_0216.htm).

During high flows, the impoundment has a spillway that discharges to Rainy Creek (Parker and Hudson, 1992).

Mill Pond

A pond in the Rainy Creek channel downstream of the tailings impoundment was constructed to provide a water supply for mining operations. The pond discharges to Rainy Creek where it mixes with flow from Carney Creek and flows downstream to the Kootenai River. This reach has some seasonal gain in flow, most likely due to groundwater input (USEPA, 2007).

Kootenai River

The Kootenai River flows from east to west along the south side of the site. Flows in the Kootenai River are controlled by the Libby Dam, which was constructed in the late-1960s and early-1970s as part of the Columbia River development for flood control, power generation, and recreation. Daily water outflow plans¹ for October 2006 through August 2007 show lowest discharge flows in March and October at approximately 4,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) and maximum discharge flows in late May/early June at 26,600 cfs.

State Water Use Designations

Table 2-2 presents designated uses for Rainy Creek and the Kootenai River near and downstream of the mine area, as classified by the State of Montana Administrative Rules Chapter 30 Water Quality Subchapter 5 (§17.30.609) for the Kootenai River drainage. The State of Montana has established numeric standards for the protection of aquatic life and human health associated with the designated uses. The numeric standards are set forth in the Montana Department of Environmental Quality Circular DEQ-7 – Montana Numeric Water Quality Standards.

Occurrence and Nature of Asbestos at the Mine

The mine is located in a region of the Precambrian Belt Series of northwestern Montana that has been intruded by an alkaline-ultramafic body. The Rainy Creek Igneous Complex comprises the upper portion of this intrusion. Hydrothermal alteration of the biotite pyroxenite intrusion produced the large, high-quality vermiculite deposit. The vermiculite content of the ore varies considerably within the deposit, ranging from 30 to 84%.

Fibrous and asbestiform amphiboles are present in association with the vermiculite ore (see [Appendix xx](#) for an overview of asbestos mineralogy). A significant portion of the fibrous amphiboles are located along cross-cutting veins and dikes and in the altered pyroxenite wall rock adjacent to them. The alteration zones, dikes, and veins that range in width from a few

¹ Available from http://www.nwd-wc.usace.army.mil/ftp/pub/project_data/yearly/lib_wy_qr.txt

millimeters to meters in thickness are found throughout the deposit. Amphibole content in the alteration zones of the deposit is estimated to range between 50-75%. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) performed electron probe micro-analysis and X-ray diffraction analysis of 30 samples obtained from the exposed asbestos veins to identify the type of amphibole asbestos present in the mine (Meeker et al. 2003). The results indicated that a variety of amphiboles exist at this site, including winchite, richterite, tremolite, actinolite, and magnesioriebeckite. The EPA refers to this mixture of amphibole asbestos minerals as Libby Amphibole Asbestos(LA).

Historic Mine Operations and Current Features

Figure 2-5 shows the current mine features and location of historical mining operations. The mine was operated from 1923 until 1990 and was open pit except for a short period in the early period of operations. The mine area is heavily disturbed by past mining activity and some areas remain largely devoid of vegetation. There are a number of areas where mine wastes have been disposed (Figure 2-5), including waste rock dumps (mainly on the south side of the mine), coarse tailings (mainly to the north of the mine), and fine tailings (placed in the tailings impoundment on the west side of the site).

The basics of ore processing did not change over the period of operation, although unit operations were changed as ore quality decreased and technology improved, and in response to concerns over dust generation (Zucker, 2006). In general, rock was removed to allow access to the vermiculite or separated from the vermiculite in the mine pits and dumped over the edge to form waste rock piles (see Figure 2-5). After 1971, ore was processed to separate out vermiculite product by crushing, screening or water floatation, with those operations generally occurring in the mill area (Figure 2-5).

A storage and loading facility along the river at the mouth of Rainy Creek was built in 1949. It included a 600-foot conveyor belt for carrying material across the Kootenai River, and a loading facility along the Great Northern Railroad tracks on the south side of the river.

A new concentrating plant began operations in 1954 in the general milling area (Figure 2-5). This plant was designed to separate the vermiculite from ore that contained less than 35% vermiculite. Continued refinements led to implementation of a wet process, in which a froth flotation process was coupled with shaking tables to separate waste rock from the vermiculite. The dry mill continued to operate. After passing through a two-inch grizzly, ore went to one of five storage bins at the mill. Ore was blended and sent to the primary screens at the mill where water was added. Oversize material was concentrated in jigs and dried in rotary driers. The material was then crushed using hammer mills and roll crushers before being screened, with finer material further separated using spiral concentrators. Material was then dewatered and dried before being screened for product. The process generated two types of waste material; coarse

tailings which were disposed in a pile to the north (Figure 2-5) and fine tailings which appear to have been discharged to Rainy Creek until a tailings impoundment was constructed in 1971.

W.R. Grace & Co.-Conn. (then known as W.R. Grace & Co.) took over mining in 1963. In 1971, they undertook a major expansion to increase capacity and improve the beneficiation process. It was at this time that the tailings impoundment was built to provide for settlement of the fine tailings produced by the new process and to recover water for reuse (Schafer, 1992). The dam was designed and constructed in stages, with a 50 foot high starter dam constructed in 1971, immediately downstream of an older, existing dam. Additional construction phases in 1975, 1977, and 1980 raised the top of the dam to a total height of 135 feet measured from the downstream toe.

Remedium reviewed historic information on mining operations at the site and reported that in a typical year about 5 million tons of rock was mined to generate 220,000 tons of vermiculite product. Primary waste materials were waste rock (3.5 million tons per year) and tailings (1.1 million tons per year), with lesser amounts of oversize rock and screening plant concentrate wastes. As higher quality ores were depleted and lesser quality ores were mined, various reagents were used to facilitate the separation. Reported reagents include #2 Diesel Fuel (typically between 1.2 and 5.4 million pounds per year), Armeen T (Tallow Alkyl Amine; 100,000 to 500,000 pounds per year), fluorosilicic acid (50,000 to 240,000 pounds per year) and lesser quantities of flocculants, defoamers, frothers and other reagents.

2.3 Ecological Setting

2.3.1 Terrestrial Habitats and Plant Species

Most of OU3 is forested, with only 4% of the land being classified as non-forest or water (USDAFSR1, 2008; Figure 2-6). Data for the National Forest indicate Douglas-fir forest type is the most common, covering nearly 35 percent of the National Forest land area. Next in abundance are the lodgepole pine forest type and spruce-fir forest type at 17 percent each, and the western larch forest type at 11 percent. Other species reported in the area are the Black Cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*), Quaking Aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), Western Paper Birch (*Betula papyrifera* var. *occidentalis*) and Pacific Yew (*Taxus brevifolia*) (USDAFSR1, 2008).

Specific vegetative surveys of the Libby OU3 mine site are not available. Therefore, an initial vegetative cover map was created using existing information from the analyses of remote sensing data. In 1998, the Wildlife Spatial Analysis Lab at the University of Montana in Missoula created the *Montana Land Cover Atlas* as part of the Montana Gap Analysis Project (Fisher et al., 1998). Data from this project classifies 50 land cover types. The group developed the classification based on the hierarchical design of Anderson et al. (197) in the same manner as was accomplished in Wyoming (Merrill et al. 1996). Land cover types were targeted and

defined according to known occurrences in the state and from classifications used for GAP projects in both Idaho (Caicco et al. 1995) and Wyoming (Merrill et al., 1996). The final list of 50 land cover types is shown in Table 2-3. Vegetative cover on and in the vicinity of the Libby OU3 Site is provided as Figure 2-7. The map is generated from Landsat Thematic Mapper (TM) data covering Montana. Upland cover types were mapped to 2 hectare (ha) minimum map unit (MMU). Based on this mapping, the vegetative cover around the mine site is predominantly Douglas-fir, lodgepole pine and mixed mesic forest.

2.3.2 Aquatic Species

Rainy Creek Watershed

Within the Rainy Creek watershed there are streams and ponds that provide habitat for aquatic species including plants, invertebrates, amphibians, and fish. Surveys of aquatic life specific to the OU3 area are not available [we understand that data may be available for sampling in Rainy Creek from the US Forest Service?].

Comment [DW1]: This is correct.

The Montana National Heritage Program (MNHP) lists 25 species of fish that are expected to occur in the area. Of these 12 are considered to be possible inhabitants of waters in the Rainy Creek watershed. These species include brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*), brown trout (*Salmo trutta*), Columbia River redband trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss gairdneri*), fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), largescale Sucker (*Catostomus macrocheilus*), longnose dace (*Rhinichthys cataractae*), longnose sucker (*Catostomus catostomus*), mottled sculpin (*Cottus bairdi*), mountain whitefish (*Prosopium williamsoni*), rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), torrent sculpin (*Cottus rhotheus*), and westslope cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii lewisi*). The Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks reports that the westslope cutthroat trout is a year round resident in both upstream Rainy Creek and upstream Carney Creek.

The ponds in OU3 may support a different composition of fish species (Table 2-?) with some species unique to the pond areas versus the streams including: black bullhead (*Ameiurus melas*), common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), mountain whitefish (*Prosopium williamsoni*), northern pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus oregonensis*), peamouth (*Mylocheilus caurinus*), river carpsucker (*Carpodes carpio*), smallmouth bass, (*Micropterus dolomieu*) and yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*).

Kootenai River

EPA's Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) has collected aquatic community data at a station on the Kootenai River about one mile downstream of the confluence with Rainy Creek. This location was sampled in August 2002. Forty-four species of aquatic invertebrates have been observed, including oligochaetes, insects (diptera, ephemeroptera,

trichoptera and hemiptera), colenterates (hydra), mollusks, and nematodes (see Table 2-4). Eleven species of fish were observed (Table 2-5). Mountain fish were most common, along with several species of salmonids (rainbow trout, sockeye salmon, cutthroat trout, bull trout) and several species forage fish (dace, shiner, sculpin)..

2.3.3 Wildlife Species on or Near the Libby OU3 Site

The Montana Natural Heritage Program is a source for information on the status and distribution of native animals and plants in Montana. An assessment of which wildlife species are expected to occur at the Libby OU3 site was performed based on the Montana Natural Heritage Program Animal Tracker (<http://nhp.nris.mt.gov/Tracker/>). First, all species known to occur within Lincoln County, Montana, were identified. Next, the Montana Natural Heritage Program and Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Animal Field Guide (<http://fieldguide.mt.gov/>) was consulted to identify if a particular species was observed near the Libby OU3 Site. Species not identified within the vicinity of OU3, and those not expected to occur at OU3 based on a consideration of available habitat, were removed. The species that remained are listed in Attachment A, along with information on general habitat requirements, habitat type for foraging and nesting, feeding guild, typical food, migration and hibernation, longevity, home range and size. The oldest recorded sighting and latest (year), and the number of individuals identified was also recorded.

[Insert some sort of short summary here]

2.3.4 Federal and State Species of Special Concern

There are six federally listed protected species that have been reported to occur in or about the vicinity of the Libby OU3 Site, including 2 fish, 1 bird, and 3 mammals. These are listed in Table 2-x. Species of concern to the State of Montana that have been observed to occur in the vicinity of Libby OU3 Site are listed in Table 2-y. This includes 3 amphibians, 34 birds, 5 mammals, 4 fish, 2 reptiles, and 8 invertebrates.

INSERT SHORT LIST HERE BASED ON FREQUENCY

2.4 Summary of Data Available from Phase I

In 2007, EPA began performance of a Remedial Investigation (RI) for Libby OU3. The RI began by collection of an initial round (referred to as Phase I) of environmental samples of a variety of media (surface water, sediment, on-site and off-site soils, tree bark) in the fall of 2007. These samples were analyzed for asbestos and/or a range of non-asbestos analytes. These initial collected during Phase I are presented in Appendix xx and are summarized below.

2.4.1 Asbestos

Surface Water

Surface water samples were collected during the Phase 1 investigation at a total of 24 locations, as shown in Figure 3-2. Surface water were analyzed for asbestos by Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) using Modified EPA Method 100.2 (USEPA, 1994a) in accord with the modified counting procedures described in Libby Laboratory Modification LB-000020 (USEPA, 2007).

Table 4-3 summarizes the results of the analysis of surface water for asbestos (LA). Results are expressed in terms of million fibers per liter (MFL). The results are also mapped in Figure 4-2 to show the spatial pattern of results. The highest levels were observed in samples located in ponds or impoundments, including the tailings impoundment, the mill pond, and the pond on Fleetwood creek, as well as from several seeps along the south side of the mined area. Levels in lower Rainy Creek (below the mill pond) are relatively lower.

Sediments

Sediment samples were collected during the Phase 1 investigation at a total of 24 locations, as shown in Figure 3-2. Samples were prepared by sieving into coarse (> ¼ inch) and fine fractions. The fine fraction was ground to reduce particles to a diameter of 250 um or less and separated into 4 aliquots. The coarse fraction soil aliquot (if any) was examined using stereomicroscopy, and any particles of asbestos (confirmed by PLM) were removed and weighed. The fine ground fraction was analyzed by PLM visual area estimation method (PLM-VE) using Libby-specific reference materials in accordance with SRC-LIBBY-03 Revision 2. Results from the PLM-VE method are semi-quantitative, with an estimated detection limit for LA of about 0.2% or slightly less.

The results of the analyses of sediments are shown in Table 4-5 **does this combine coarse + fine?** The results are also mapped in Figure 4-4 to show the spatial pattern of results. Results for LA in sediment are expressed as mass percent (grams of asbestos per 100 grams of soil) if the concentration is 1% or higher. If the estimated concentration is <1%, the results are expressed semi-quantitatively, according to the following scheme:

PLM-VE Result	Range of Mass Percent
A (ND)	None detected (likely < 0.05%)
B1 (Trace)	LA detected, > 0% but < 0.2%
B2 (<1%)	LA detected, >0.2% but < 1%

Nearly all (22 out of 24) of the sediment samples collected contain LA. Of these, one is classified as Bin B1 (<0.2%), 12 are classified as Bin B2 (about 0.2 to 1%), and 9 were estimated

to contain levels from 2-7%. These results indicate that asbestos in sediment is widespread throughout the surface water features draining the site, and that levels are substantial in many locations.

Mine Wastes and Soils

Figure 3-4 shows the locations of the mine waste and/or soil samples. The Phase I samples focused on each of the principal mine waste materials identified to date including mine waste rock, impounded tailings, and coarse tailings as well soils in the former mill area and soils in the former mill area; and materials used for construction of unpaved sections of Rainy Creek Road.

Soil samples collected for asbestos analysis were prepared and analyzed in the same manner as previously described for sediments. Table 4-7 summarizes the results of the analysis of mine waste and soil asbestos (LA). **coarse + fine?** All but one soil sample (33 of 34) contained LA. Of these, two are classified as Bin B1 (<0.2%), 26 are classified as Bin B2 (0.2% to 1%), and 5 are estimated to contain levels from 2-8%.

Tree Bark, Forest Soil and Duff

During Phase 1, samples of tree bark, forest soil and organic debris (duff) were collected at a number of stations located on transects that radiate away from the mine, with special emphasis on the predominant downwind direction (northeast) (Figure 4-7). All bark samples were collected from the side of the tree facing toward the mine site, from a height of about 4-5 feet above ground. Forest soil and duff samples were collected from approximately equally spaced locations around the perimeter of a circle with a radius of about 5 feet, centered on the tree where the bark sample was collected. The grab samples were combined into one composite and analyzed for asbestos as previously described for mine waste and soils.

The soil samples were analyzed for LA by PLM-VE. The results are provided in Table 4-9 and are plotted in Figure 4-8. As seen, LA was detectable in a number of soil samples located relatively close to the mined area, but was not detectable at a distance more than about **___ meters** from the mined area. **The transport mechanism leading to the observed soil contamination is not known, but considering the high levels seen in some locations, it is considered likely that water-based erosion may have contributed.**

Comment [DW2]: This may be the case for soils immediately adjacent to the mine but some detections are up slope from the mine.

The results of the tree bark and duff samples are not yet available.

Ambient Air

The purpose of the Phase I ambient air sampling was to obtain data on the level of releases occurring from the mine area to adjacent downwind areas under current site conditions. The

basic sampling design for ambient air consists of two concentric rings of stationary air monitors placed around the mine. The first ring is close to the boundary of the disturbed area, and the second ring is close to the perimeter of the property owned by KDC. Figure 4-11 shows the locations for the ambient air monitors. Each sample was collected over a period of 5 days, with samples being collected once per week for a period of four weeks. All air samples were analyzed for asbestos by TEM in accord with the ISO 10312 method (ISO 1995) counting protocols, with all applicable Libby site-specific laboratory modifications, including the most recent versions of modifications as specified in the SAP (USEPA, 2007).

The results of analyses of asbestos in the ambient air samples is provided as Table 4-11. Asbestos was not detected in any of the field samples. These results should be interpreted cautiously because ambient air samples were collected over a time interval when rain was occurring frequently, which may have reduced the potential for airborne releases to ambient air.

2.4.2 Non-Asbestos Contaminants

Surface Water

Surface water samples were collected during the Phase 1 investigation at a total of 24 locations, as shown in Figure 3-2. The surface water samples collected during Phase I were analyzed for metals and metalloids, petroleum hydrocarbons, anions, and other water quality parameters. In addition, several selected surface water samples were analyzed for a broad suite of other chemicals. Table 3-2 lists the analytical methods and analyses for the Phase I samples. Table 3-3 shows the analyses that were performed for each sampling location. In addition to laboratory analyses, surface water samples were analyzed in the field for surface water quality parameters. Surface water flow was also measured at each sampling location.

The results of the analyses of Phase I surface water samples for non-asbestos analytes are provided in Table 3-4. The analytes listed in the table are those that were detected in at least one surface water sample. The results of water quality parameters measured in the field are provided in Table 3-5. Flow measurements are provided in Table 3-6. Nine metals were detected as well as benzene, aliphatic hydrocarbons, total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH), total extractable hydrocarbons (TEH), nitrate, nitrite, chloride, fluoride, sulfate, and phosphate. Volatile organic chemicals (VOCs), semi-volatile organic chemicals (SVOCs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), pesticides and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) were not detected in any of the surface water samples.

Sediment

Sediment water samples were collected during the Phase 1 investigation at a total of 24 locations, as shown in Figure 3-2. All sediment samples were analyzed for asbestos, metals and metalloids,

petroleum hydrocarbons, and several sediment quality parameters. In addition, several selected sediment samples were analyzed for a broad suite of other chemicals. Table 3-7 lists the analytical methods that were employed, and Table 3-8 shows the analyses that were performed at each station.

The results of the analyses of the Phase I sediment samples are provided in Table 3-9. The analytes listed in the table are those that were detected in at least one sediment sample. The full results of the analyses are included in Attachment B. Fifteen metals were detected as pyrene, methyl acetate, aromatic and aliphatic hydrocarbons, TEH, and TPH. PCBs, SVOCs and pesticides and were not detected in any of the sediment samples.

On-Site Soil and Mine Waste

Figure 3-3 shows the locations of the on-site mine waste and/or soil samples collected during Phase I. These samples focused on each of the principal mine waste materials identified to date including mine waste rock, impounded tailings, and coarse tailings as well soils in the former mill area and soils in the former mill area; and materials used for construction of unpaved sections of Rainy Creek Road. These samples are divided into six categories:

Road	MS-1 to MS-2
Tailings Impoundment	MS-4 and M-5
Coarse Tailings	MS-6 to MS-9
Cover Material	MS-10 to MS-13; MS-21 to MS-24
Waste Rock	MS-14 to MS-20; MS-26 to MS-30; MS-32
Outcrop	MS-25; MS-31; MS-33-38

All mine waste and soil samples were analyzed for asbestos, metals and metalloids, petroleum hydrocarbons, as well as pH, moisture content and organic carbon content. This was with the exception of outcrop samples which were not analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons. In addition, several selected mine waste and soil samples were analyzed for a broad suite of other chemicals. Table 3-10 lists the analytical methods that were used, and Table 3-11 shows the analyses that were performed at each sampling location.

The results of the analyses of the Phase I mine waste and soil samples are provided in Table 3-12. The results listed in the table are those for analytes that were detected in at least one mine waste or soil sample. The full results of the analyses from the Phase 1 sampling program are included in Attachment B. Fifteen metals, eight PAHs, one pesticide (pentachlorophenol), one VOC (methylacetate), aromatic and aliphatic hydrocarbons, TEH, toluene and TPH were detected. PCBs and SVOCs were not detected in any of the mine waste and soil samples.

3.0 CONCEPTUAL SITE MODELS

After review of available information on the site, the ecological setting and the nature of contaminants that may be present, the next step in problem formulation for an ecological risk assessment is the development of a Conceptual Site Model (CSM). The CSM is a schematic summary of what is known about the nature of source materials at a site, the pathways by which contaminants may migrate through the environment, and the scenarios by which receptors may be exposed to site-related contaminants. When information is sufficient, the CSM may also indicate which of the exposure scenarios for each receptor are likely to be the most significant, and which (if any) are likely to be sufficiently minor that detailed evaluation is not needed.

Figure 3-1 presents the CSM for exposure of each general ecological receptor group (fish, benthic invertebrates, terrestrial plants, soil invertebrates, birds and mammals and amphibians) to non-asbestos mining-related contaminants, and Figure 3-2 presents the CSM for exposure to asbestos. The two CSMs are similar to each other, except that the exposure pathways of chief concern may differ due to the differing properties of asbestos and non-asbestos contaminants.

As seen, each receptor group may be exposed by several different pathways. However, not all pathways are equally likely to be important. In each CSM, pathways are divided into four main categories:

- A solid black circle (●) represents pathways that are believed to be complete, and which may provide an important contribution to the total risk to a receptor group.
- An open circle (○) represents an exposure pathway that is believed to be complete, but which is unlikely to be a major contributor to the total risk to a receptor group, at least in comparison to one or more other pathways that are evaluated.
- A question mark (?) represents an exposure pathway that is believed to be complete, but data available are not adequate to decide if the pathway is or is not a major contributor to the total risk to the receptor group.
- An open box represents an exposure pathway that is believed to be incomplete (now and in the future). Thus, this pathway is not assessed.

The following sections provide a more detailed discussion of the main elements of these CSMs.

3.1 Potential Sources of Contamination

The main sources of asbestos contamination at this site are the mine wastes generated by historic vermiculite mining and milling activities. This includes piles of waste rock and waste ore at on-

site locations, as well as the coarse tailings pile and the fine tailings impoundment. These wastes may also be sources of metals and other inorganic constituents of the ore. In addition, some chemicals used at the mine site in the processing of vermiculite ore might also be present in onsite wastes, including diesel fuel, alkyl amines, fluorosilicic acid, and various other flocculants, defoamers, frothers and other reagents.

3.2 Migration Pathways in the Environment

From the sources, contaminants may be released and transported via airborne emissions, surface water transport or food chain transport.

Airborne Transport. Contaminants may become suspended in air and transported from sources via release mechanisms such as wind, mechanical disturbances and/or erosion. Once airborne, contaminants may move with the air and then settle and become deposited onto surface soils. This pathway is likely to be important for asbestos, but is thought to be of low concern for non-asbestos contaminants.

Surface Transport. Contaminants may be carried in surface water runoff (e.g., from rain or snowmelt) from the mine or other areas where soil is contaminated, and become deposited in soils or sediments at downstream locations. This pathway is equally applicable to both asbestos and non-asbestos contaminants.

Food Chain Transport. Contaminants may be taken up from water, sediment or soil into the tissues of aquatic or terrestrial organisms from water and/or sediment and/or soils and/or prey items into prey items (fish, benthic invertebrate, plants, soil invertebrates, birds, mammals). This is applicable to both asbestos and non-asbestos contaminants.

3.3 Potentially Exposed Ecological Receptors

As discussed in Section 2.3, there are a large number of ecological species that are likely to occur in OU3 and that could be exposed to mine-related contaminants. However, it is generally not feasible or necessary to evaluate risks to each species individually. Rather, it is usually appropriate to group receptors with similar behaviors and exposure patterns, and to evaluate the risks to each group.

For aquatic receptors, organisms are usually evaluated in two groups:

- Fish
- Benthic macroinvertebrates

For terrestrial receptors, organisms are usually grouped into five broad categories:

- Plants
- Soil invertebrates
- Birds
- Mammals
- Amphibians

Screening assessment usually begins by assessing risks to each group as a unit. In cases where risks appear to be above a level of concern for a large group (e.g., birds, mammals), it may sometimes be useful to divide the groups into smaller sub-groups to allow a more refined assessment. For example, when needed, birds and mammals may be stratified into a number of feeding guilds. Based on the information regarding the types of birds and mammals that are present at this site, the following feeding guilds may be useful if a refined assessment is required for an assessment of wildlife populations at the site.

- *Invertivorous Wildlife* – Invertivorous wildlife consume primarily soil invertebrates and are important in nutrient processing and energy transfer within the terrestrial environment. Insectivorous birds and bats are also important in the control of populations of emerging aquatic insects. These animals also are important food sources for other mammals and birds (carnivores). This group of receptors can be further subdivided according to where and how the organism feeds on invertebrates. Some avian species are *aerial invertivores* feeding on insects in flight. Other avian and mammalian species feed primarily on invertebrates in trees (*arboreal insectivores*).
- *Herbivorous Wildlife* – Herbivorous wildlife consume primarily plant material and are important in nutrient processing and energy transfer within the terrestrial environment. Small herbivorous mammals are important food resources for other mammals and birds (carnivores). This group of receptors can be further subdivided into those species that consume primarily fruit (*frugivores*) and nectar (*nectaravores*). In particular avian species that consume nectar are important in the pollination of plants.
- *Omnivorous Wildlife* – Omnivorous wildlife consume both plant and animals. They are also important in nutrient processing and energy transfer within the terrestrial environment and may serve as food resources for carnivores. Most mammalian and avian species are not strict insectivores or herbivores and instead consume both plant and animal matter usually depending upon the availability of food resources. For risk assessment purposes for evaluating contaminant exposures, mammals and birds are classified into these general groups based on their primary food types. Otherwise most animals would be classified as omnivores.
- *Granivores* – Granivorous wildlife consume primarily seeds. These mammals and birds are important in the dispersal of plants as well as nutrient processing and energy transfer. They also serve as food resources for other mammals and birds (carnivores).

- *Carnivorous Wildlife* – Carnivorous mammals and birds consume primarily other mammals and birds. Carnivores are important in the control of rodents and other small mammals with high reproductive capacities.
- *Aquatic Invertivores* – Aquatic invertivores are mammals and birds that consume primarily aquatic invertebrates. These organisms are important in the nutrient processing and energy transfer between the aquatic and terrestrial environments. Some avian and bat species consume primarily emerging insects and are important in the control of these populations.
- *Piscivores* – Piscivorous mammals and birds consume primarily fish. These organisms are important in the nutrient processing and energy transfer between the aquatic and terrestrial environments.

If a more detailed assessment of feeding guilds is needed, the most common approach is to select a representative species to represent the group. The table below identifies the surrogate species that may be appropriate:

Representative Species for Assessment within Mine Site Area		
Feeding Guild	Species representative of:	Representative Species
Mammalian Invertivore	Small mammalian species that feed primarily on soil invertebrates	Masked Shrew (<i>Sorex cinereus</i>)
Avian Invertivore	Small avian species that feed primarily on soil invertebrates	Northern Flicker (<i>Colaptes auratus</i>)
Mammalian Omnivore	Small mammalian species that feed primarily on seeds and/or vegetation and some invertebrates.	Deer Mouse (<i>Peromyscus maniculatus</i>).
Avian Omnivore	Small avian species that feed primarily on seeds and/or vegetation and some invertebrates.	American Robin (<i>Turdus migratorius</i>)
Avian Grainivore	Avian species that feed primarily on seeds and grains.	Mourning Dove (<i>Zenaida macroura</i>)
Mammalian Aquatic Invertivore	Mammalian species that feed primarily on aquatic invertebrates.	Water Shrew (<i>Sorex palustris</i>)
Avian Aquatic Invertivore	Avian species that feed primarily on aquatic invertebrates.	American Dipper (<i>Cinclus mexicanus</i>)
Mammalian Piscivore	Mammalian species that feed primarily on fish.	Mink (<i>Mustela vison</i>)
Avian Piscivore	Avian species that feed primarily on aquatic fish.	Belted Kingfisher (<i>Megaceryle alcyon</i>)

3.4 Exposure Pathways of Chief Concern

Fish

The primary exposure pathway for fish is direct contact with contaminants in surface water. This is applicable to both asbestos and non-asbestos contaminants. Fish may also be exposed to contaminants by ingestion of contaminated prey items, and incidental ingestion of sediment while feeding. Direct contact with sediment may also occur. This is often assumed to be minor compared the pathways above.

Benthic Invertebrates

Benthic invertebrates may be exposed to contaminants in surface water and/or sediment via ingestion and/or direct contact. Benthic invertebrates may also be exposed to contaminants via ingestion of aquatic prey items that have accumulated contaminants in their tissues. This is applicable to both asbestos and non-asbestos contaminants.

Terrestrial Plants and Soil Invertebrates

Terrestrial plants and soil invertebrates (e.g., worms) are exposed mainly by direct contact between roots and contaminants in soil. Exposure of plants may also occur due to deposition of contaminated dust on foliar (leaf) surfaces, but this pathway is generally believed to be small compared to root exposure. It is suspected (but not certain) that asbestos in soil is not likely to be toxic to plants. It is not known whether asbestos in soil is toxic to soil invertebrates such as worms.

Mammals and Birds

Mammals and birds may be exposed to asbestos and non-asbestos contaminants via ingestion of soils, surface water, sediment and food. Mammals and birds may also be exposed to asbestos by inhalation exposures when feeding or foraging activities result in the disturbance of asbestos-contaminated soils, sediments or other media. Direct contact (i.e., dermal exposure) of birds and mammals to soils may occur in some cases, but these exposures are usually considered to be minor in comparison to exposures from ingestion (USEPA, 2003). Likewise, inhalation exposure to non-asbestos contaminants in airborne dusts is possible for all birds and mammals, but this pathway is generally considered to be minor compared to ingestion pathways (USEPA, 2003).

Amphibians

Amphibians inhabit both aquatic and terrestrial environments with early life stages being primarily aquatic and latter life stages are terrestrial. Amphibians in their early aquatic life stages may be exposed to contaminants in surface water via ingestion and direct contact. They may also be exposed to contaminants in sediment via ingestion and direct contact and to contaminants in aquatic prey items via ingestion. In the terrestrial environment, amphibians may be exposed to contaminants in soils via ingestion and/or direct contact and also as the result of ingestion of terrestrial prey items. Toxicity data for amphibians exposed to contaminants in soils and food are largely not available making it impossible to evaluate the relative contribution of these exposure pathways to the total risk for the receptor.

4.0 MANAGEMENT GOALS AND ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES

4.1 Management Goals

Management goals are descriptions of the basic objectives which the risk manager wishes to achieve. The overall management goal identified for ecological health at the Libby OU3 site for non-asbestos contamination is:

Ensure adequate protection of ecological receptors within the Libby OU3 Site from the adverse effects of exposures to mining-related releases of asbestos and other chemical contaminants to the environment. "Adequate protection" is generally defined as the reduction of risks to levels that will result in the recovery and maintenance of healthy local populations and communities of biota (USEPA, 1999).

In order to provide greater specificity regarding the general management goals and to identify specific measurable ecological values to be protected, the following list of sub-goals was derived:

- Ensure adequate protection of the aquatic communities in Rainy Creek, Fleetwood Creek, the Tailings Impoundment, the Mill Pond, the Carney Creek Pond, and Carney Creek from the adverse effects of asbestos and other site-related contaminants in surface water and sediment.
- Ensure adequate protection of terrestrial plant and soil invertebrate communities within the mined area from the adverse effects of asbestos and other site-related contaminants in soils.
- Ensure adequate protection of the mammalian and avian assessment populations from adverse effects non asbestos contaminants in the mined area and the site drainages, and from the adverse effects of asbestos in the mined area, the site-related drainages and the surrounding forest area.
- Ensure adequate protection of the amphibian assessment population from adverse effects asbestos and non asbestos contaminants in the mined area and the site drainages, and the surrounding forest area.

4.2 Definition of Population

A "population" can be defined in multiple ways. A common definition of the biological population by ecologists is: "A group of plants, animals and other organisms, all of the same species that live together and reproduce. Individual organisms must be sufficiently close geographically to reproduce. Sub-populations are parts of a population among which gene flow is restricted, but within which all individuals have some chance of mating any other individual" (Menzie et al., 2007). "Population" can also be defined differently in the context of a

management goal. To prevent miscommunication in risk assessment and risk management, use of the term “assessment population” is recommended (USEPA, 2003). In problem formulation it is necessary to explicitly state the assessment population(s). The assessment population may be the same as the biological population as defined by ecologists or may be: 1) a component of the biological population (e.g., exposed population); or, 2) a component of relevant meta-population (e.g., a subpopulation).

For the Libby OU3 Site, the assessment populations are defined as the groups of organisms that reside in locations that have been impacted by mining-related releases. For exposure to non-asbestos contaminants, this is believed to be restricted to the mined area and the drainages associated with the mined area. For asbestos, the impacted area may also include surrounding forest lands that were impacted by airborne releases of asbestos. This information will be based on results of the RI, including the spatial pattern of asbestos contamination in forest soils and tree bark.

4.3 Assessment Endpoints

Assessment endpoints are explicit statements of the characteristics of the ecological system that are to be protected. Because the risk management goals are formulated in terms of the protection of populations and communities of ecological receptors, the assessment endpoints selected for use in this problem formulation focus endpoints that are directly related to population stability. This includes:

- Mortality
- Growth
- Reproduction

Other assessment endpoints may be appropriate in some circumstances, if it is believed that the endpoint can be related to population stability.

4.4 Measurement Endpoints

Measurement endpoints were initially defined by EPA guidance to represent quantifiable ecological characteristics that could be measured, interpreted, and related to the valued ecological components chosen as the assessment endpoints (USEPA 1992, 1997a). The term measurement endpoint was later replaced with the term *measures of effect* and was supplemented by two other categories of measures (USEPA, 1998). This problem formulation still uses the term measurement endpoint to describe both measures of exposure and effect.

There are a number of different techniques available to ecological risk assessors for measuring the impact of site releases on assessment endpoints and assessing whether or not risk

management goals are achieved. The strategies that are available for use at this site are discussed below.

1. The Hazard Quotient (HQ) Approach

A Hazard Quotient (HQ) is the ratio of the estimated exposure of a receptor to a "benchmark" that is believed to be without significant risk of unacceptable adverse effect:

$$\text{HQ} = \text{Exposure} / \text{Benchmark}$$

Exposure may be expressed in a variety of ways, including:

- Concentration of a contaminant in an environmental medium (water, sediment, diet and soil)
- Concentration of a contaminant in tissue
- Amount of a contaminant that is ingested by a receptor

In all cases, the exposure and benchmark must be expressed in like units. For example, exposure in surface water (mg/L) must be compared to a benchmark in mg/L. If the value of an HQ is less than 1E+00, risk of unacceptable adverse effects in the exposed individual is judged to be acceptable. If the HQ exceeds 1E+00, the risk of adverse effect in the exposed individual is of potential concern.

However, not all HQ values are equally reliable as predictors of effect. Interpretation of the ecological consequences of HQ values that exceed 1.0 depends on the species being evaluated and on the toxicological endpoint underlying the toxicity benchmark. In most cases, the benchmark values used to compute HQ values are not based on site-specific toxicity data, and do not account for site-specific factors that may either increase or decrease the toxicity of the metals compared to what is observed in the laboratory. In addition, benchmark values are often not available for the species of feeding guild of concern, so values are extrapolated from other similar types of receptors. Consequently, most HQ values should be interpreted as estimates rather than highly precise predictions.

2. Site-Specific Toxicity Tests (SSTT)

Site-specific toxicity tests measure the response of receptors that are exposed to site media. This may be done either in the field or in the laboratory using media collected from the site. The chief advantage of this approach is that site-specific conditions which can influence toxicity are usually accounted for, and that the cumulative effects of all contaminants in the medium are evaluated simultaneously. One potential limitation of this approach is that, if toxic effects are observed to occur when test organisms are exposed to site media, it is usually not possible to specify which contaminant or combination of contaminants is responsible for the effect without further testing or

evaluation. A second limitation is that it may be difficult to perform tests on site samples that reflect the full range of environmental conditions which may occur in the field across time and space.

3. Population and Community Demographic Observations (PCDO)

Another approach for evaluating possible adverse effects of environmental contamination on ecological receptors is to make direct observations on the receptors in the field, seeking to determine whether any receptor population has unusual numbers of individuals (either lower or higher than expected), or whether the diversity (number of different species) of a particular category of receptors (e.g., plants, benthic organisms, birds) is different than expected. The chief advantage of this approach is that direct observation of community status does not require making the numerous assumptions and estimates needed in the HQ approach. However, there are also a number of important limitations to this approach. The most important of these is that both the abundance and diversity depend on many site-specific factors (habitat suitability, availability of food, predator pressure, natural population cycles, meteorological conditions, etc.), and it is often difficult to know what the expected (non-impacted) abundance and diversity should be in a particular area. This problem is generally approached by seeking an appropriate "reference area" (either the site itself before the impact occurred, or some similar site that has not been impacted), and comparing the observed abundance and diversity in the reference area to that for the site. However, it is sometimes quite difficult to locate reference areas that are truly a good match for all of the important habitat variables at the site, so comparisons based on this approach do not always establish firm cause-and-effect conclusions regarding the impact of environmental contamination on a receptor population.

4. In-Situ Measures of Exposure and Effects (IMEE)

An additional approach for evaluating the possible adverse effects of environmental contamination on ecological receptors is to make direct observations on receptors in the field, seeking to identify if individuals have higher exposure (tissue) levels, observed lesions and/or deformities that are higher than expected. This method has the advantage of integrating most (if not all) factors that influence the bioavailability of contaminants in the field. The limitations of this method may be in the interpretation of the consequences of the measured exposure or effect (if suitable toxicity information are not available) and if an appropriate reference population for comparison is available.

It is important to note that the choice of which one or more of these basic approaches is needed or useful in the assessment process may vary between sites, receptors groups, and contaminant types. Section 5 presents the sequence of assessment steps that will be used to evaluate risks to

ecological receptors from non-asbestos contaminants, and Section 6 describes the strategy that will be used to evaluate ecological risks from asbestos.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF RISKS FROM NON-ASBESTOS CONTAMINANTS

5.1 Assessment Strategy

Figure 5-1 provides a flow diagram that outlines the basic strategy that will be used to assess risks from non-asbestos contaminants to terrestrial receptors (plants, wildlife) at the mine site and to aquatic receptors (fish, invertebrates) in the surface water drainages associated with the mine. Each of the steps is described below.

Initial HQ Screen

For non-asbestos analytes, the HQ approach will be the first line of assessment for all receptor groups. This will begin with a screening-level HQ assessment for each analyte in each medium. In this step, a maximum HQ value (HQ_{max}) will be calculated for each medium for each receptor group exposed to the medium, based on the highest detected level of each chemical in each medium. If the maximum concentration does not exceed 1.0, it will be concluded that risks from that chemical in that medium to that receptor group are of minimal concern and that further assessment is not required.

Refined Screen

If the potential for concern for a chemical in a medium can not be excluded based on the initial HQ screen, then a refined HQ screen will be performed. This will include an evaluation of the frequency and magnitude of HQ exceedences, and an evaluation of spatial pattern of exceedences. If exceedences are infrequent and of low magnitude, and these are scattered across the site, then the chemical will be judged to be of low concern to the receptor population. However, if the magnitude and frequency of exceedences are significant, and/or if the exceedences are clustered in a specific sub-location, then the chemical will be retained for further assessment.

Comment [DW3]: Additionally, the refined screen should include a close look at the exposure parameters and TRVs

Comparison to Background

If further assessment is required, the concentration levels seen in site samples will be compared using appropriate statistical methods to concentrations that are judged to be representative of background (natural) conditions in the area. This is most important for metals, since metals occur naturally in soil and water. It may also be useful for some organic compounds that occur naturally (alkanes, PAHs, etc.). If site levels appear to be similar to natural background levels, further assessment will not be required. If site levels appear to be elevated above natural background, the further assessment may be warranted, as described below.

Other Lines of Evidence

If the potential for concern for a chemical in a medium can not be excluded based on the steps above, then the utility of obtaining data from lines of investigation will be considered. This may include site-specific toxicity tests and/or community surveys. These tests, if needed, are most likely to be useful for evaluation of risks to fish from surface water, risks to benthic invertebrates from sediment, and risks to plants and soil invertebrates from soil. Further assessment of risks to wildlife receptors, if needed, may conceptually use the same techniques (site-specific toxicity testing, community surveys), although implementing these techniques for wildlife is somewhat more difficult for birds and mammals than for aquatic receptors.

5.2 Initial Screen Results Based on Phase I Data

As noted in Section 2, one round of environmental sampling (referred to as Phase I) of surface water, sediment and on-site soils has been completed at the site in the fall of 2007. These data include measurements of a wide range of non-asbestos analytes, including metals, VOCs, SVOCs, PAHs, PCBs, pesticides, radionuclides, nitrogen compounds, and anions.

It is important to note that the Phase I data alone are not considered sufficient to support the HQ-based assessment steps or background comparison step shown in Figure 5-1 because the data represent only one point in time, and may not fully capture either temporal or spatial variability at the site. For this reason, final implementation of the assessment process will not be performed until two additional rounds of environmental data (scheduled for collection in the spring and summer of 2008) are collected.

Nevertheless, the Phase I data are sufficient to provide an initial impression regarding the potential for concern from non-asbestos contaminants at the site. The results of the initial screening step performed on the Phase I data are presented below.

Surface Water

An initial screening for chemicals of potential concern (COPCs) in surface water was completed by comparing the highest measured concentration of a chemical in surface water to available aquatic toxicity screening benchmarks. The selected screening benchmarks are described in detail in Attachment C and are listed in Table 3-4. All maximum detected concentrations of metals are lower than respective benchmarks. Benchmarks are not available for either volatile or extractable hydrocarbons. These were detected at three sampling locations two of which are on seeps at Carney Creek (CCS-14 and CCS-11; Figure 3-2) and one is on Fleetwood Creek (FC-2; Figure 3-2).

Sediment

An initial screening for COPCs in sediments was completed by comparing the highest measured concentration of a chemical in sediment to respective sediment toxicity screening benchmarks. The selected screening benchmarks are described in Attachment C and are listed in Table 3-9. Maximum detected concentrations of aluminum, chromium, iron, lead, manganese, nickel, selenium and pyrene exceed respective screening benchmarks based on Threshold Effect Concentrations (TECs), and maximum detected concentrations of chromium, manganese and nickel also exceed respective benchmarks based on Probable Effect Concentrations (PECs). Benchmarks are not available for either volatile or extractable hydrocarbons.

Mine Waste and Soils

An initial screening for COPCs in soils was completed by comparing the highest measured concentration of a chemical in mine waste or soil with respective to available toxicity screening benchmarks for plants, soil invertebrates and wildlife. The selected screening benchmarks are described in detail in Attachment C and are listed in Table 3-12.

For terrestrial plants, mean and maximum detected concentrations of cobalt, copper, manganese, nickel and vanadium are higher than respective toxicity screening benchmarks. For soil invertebrates, the maximum detected concentration of manganese is higher than the toxicity screening benchmark. For wildlife, the mean and maximum detected concentrations of chromium, copper, lead and vanadium are higher than respective toxicity screening benchmarks. The maximum detected concentrations of nickel and zinc also exceed respective benchmarks. All other maximum detected concentrations are lower than respective benchmarks. Benchmarks are not available for either volatile or extractable hydrocarbons or methyl acetate.

Summary

Based on the first round of data collected in the fall of 2007, it is tentatively concluded that risks to ecological receptors are likely to be low for most non-asbestos contaminants, although a few contaminants may be of potential concern and require further assessment. Final decisions about which non-asbestos contaminants may be excluded in the initial screen and which require further assessment will be made after receipt of two additional rounds of data from the spring and summer of 2008.

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF RISKS FROM ASBESTOS

6.1 Overview of Asbestos

Appendix xx presents a review of a number of important aspects of asbestos that may be needed in problem formulation and ecological risk assessment for asbestos. This includes a discussion of the basic mineralogy of asbestos, techniques for measuring asbestos in environmental media, fate and transport properties of asbestos, and a review of the available ecological toxicity data for asbestos. The following sections provide a brief summary of the more detailed information presented in Appendix xx,

Comment [DW4]: I think the Asbestos appendix should be inserted here and eliminated as an appendix.

Mineralogy

Asbestos is the generic name for a group of naturally-occurring silicate minerals that crystallize in the form of long thin fibers. Based on crystal structure, there are two main types: serpentine and amphibole. The asbestos at the Libby site is amphibole asbestos. No evidence of serpentine asbestos has been reported.

There are a number of differing types of amphibole asbestos. These differ from each other mainly in the type of cations that are bound to the polysilicate backbone. At the Libby site, there are a mixture of types. The most common are winchite and richterite, with lesser amounts of tremolite and possibly magnesiorichterite (Meeker et al., 2003). This mixture is referred to as Libby Amphibole Asbestos (LA).

Measurement Techniques

Most measurement techniques for asbestos are based on microscopy. That is, a sample of environmental medium is placed under a microscope and visually examined by a trained microscopist who counts the number of asbestos fibers that are observed. There are a number of different types of microscope that may be used, and a number of different "counting rules" that define what will be identified as a "countable" asbestos particle.

For examination of solid media (soil, sediment, etc), the most common microscopic technique is Polarized Light Microscopy (PLM). This technique can distinguish different types of asbestos based on the morphology and optical properties of the particles. Results are generally expressed in terms of mass fraction (grams of asbestos per gram of soil media). The method yields quantitative values for concentrations above about 1%, and semi-quantitative estimates for levels below 1%. The detection limit is not well established, but is probably about 0.05-0.1%.

For water and air, samples are prepared for analysis by passing through a filter that traps all of the asbestos (and any other particulate matter) on the filter surface. In the past, the filters were analyzed by Phase Contrast Microscopy (PCM), but this technique can not distinguish asbestos from non-asbestos particles, and can not visualize thin fibers ($< 0.25 \mu\text{m}$). Therefore, at present the preferred technique is Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM). This technique can distinguish asbestos from non-asbestos particles, can distinguish between different types of asbestos, and can see very thin structures.

In most cases, TEM "counting rules" begin by defining a "fiber". All methods define fibers as long and thin structures that have approximately parallel sides that have a minimum aspect ratio (length/width) of 3:1 or 5:1. Some methods focus only on fibers longer than $5 \mu\text{m}$, while other methods count all fibers longer than $0.5 \mu\text{m}$. Because fibers may sometimes exist in complex arrangements with other fibers (bundles, clusters), each set of counting rules has its own procedure for dealing with these structures. Thus, it is always important to specify which microscopic technique and which counting rules have been used to derive measurements of asbestos concentrations.

Fate and Transport

The main attribute of asbestos, especially amphibole asbestos, is that it is very stable. It is not soluble in water and is not volatile. Thus, asbestos in contaminated soil tends to remain in place indefinitely.

However, particles of asbestos can be transported by both air and water. Fibers of asbestos are sufficiently small that they tend to remain suspended in both air and water for long periods, settling out only under calm or low-flow conditions. Larger particles may also be transported by wind and water, but these particles tend to settle out more readily because of their larger mass.

Toxicological Effects of Exposure

INSERT summary--what are effects of oral and inhalation exposure on various types of critter

6.2 Assessment Strategy

Conceptually, the process of assessing ecological risks from asbestos might follow the same procedure as used for non-asbestos contaminants (see Figure 5-1). As noted previously, this approach depends upon the availability of relevant and reliable toxicity reference values or benchmarks for the contaminants of potential concern.

However, in the case of asbestos, no toxicity benchmarks have been derived to date for any receptor class, and most of the studies that are available to potentially serve as a basis for a

benchmark are based on studies of chrysotile asbestos rather than amphibole asbestos. In particular, there are no studies on the toxicity of LA on any class of ecological receptors. Because of this, it is concluded that available data are not sufficient at present to employ an assessment strategy that is HQ-based. Rather, the strategy for assessing risks from asbestos must be based on information that can be collected from field studies of the following types:

- Site-specific toxicity testing
- Site-specific population surveys
- Site-specific studies of biomarkers of exposure and effect

As was the case for non-asbestos contaminants, it is expected that the evaluation of risks from asbestos for each receptor class will follow a phased approach, with the need and design of each phase being influenced by the results of earlier findings. The detailed assessment strategies planned for aquatic receptors, terrestrial plants and soil invertebrates, and terrestrial wildlife (birds, mammals) are described below.

6.2.1 Strategy for Assessing Risks to Aquatic Receptors

Tier 1: Site-Specific Toxicity Testing

The first tier of assessment for site surface water will be site-specific toxicity testing. Figure 6-1 provides a conceptual flow diagram of the approach.

Step 1. Collect surface water from multiple on-site locations at a time when concentration of asbestos are expected to be at their highest (during the peak of spring runoff)

Step 2. Evaluate the toxicity of each water (undiluted) to an appropriate aquatic species (e.g., rainbow trout) of an appropriate age class (e.g., fry).

Step 3a. If toxicity is seen in one or more waters, use the data to estimate a site-specific exposure-response curve. In addition, select the water with the highest toxicity (highest concentration) and repeat the toxicity tests on a dilution series of that water. The purpose is to further support an empiric site-specific exposure-response curve for asbestos.

Comment [DW5]: Histo and body burden

Step 3b. If no toxicity is observed in any site water, perform a study in which asbestos is added to water to yield concentrations even higher than achieved in the site waters. If toxicity is seen in this spiking study, the data can be used to derive a site-specific exposure-response curve for LA.

Comment [DW6]: Histo and body burden

The details of the site-specific toxicity testing protocol are provided in SOP-xx. In brief, the study will be conducted using rainbow trout fry. The same approach may be followed using other aquatic species, as deemed appropriate. Exposure will occur in three 4-L aquaria, each containing 15 larvae. Air bubblers will be used to ensure that asbestos particles in the water remain suspended. The water will be changed weekly. Endpoints will include qualitative observations on feeding and swimming behavior, and quantitative data on mortality and growth.

Comment [DW7]: I believe Belanger used larvae. The age of these fish we test should be the same as Belanger.

Comment [DW8]: Circulating, no filter.

Deleted: fry

The first tier of assessment of sediment will also be site-specific toxicity testing. Figure 6-2 provides a conceptual flow diagram for how this will be done. As shown, the approach is similar to that for surface water, except that the site-specific exposure response curve can be developed based on the site samples with the need for a dilution series because the samples selected for testing can be chosen to reflect the range of values seen on-site, from lowest to highest.

Tier 2: Population and Community Demographic Observations

Depending on the results of the site-specific toxicity tests of surface water and sediment, it may be appropriate to collect data on the density and diversity of receptors (fish and/or benthic organisms) in site waters compared to appropriate reference locations. This type of data can add a valuable independent line of evidence to be used in conjunction with the toxicity testing data. As needed, the collection of population and community demographic information will be performed as follows:

Benthic Invertebrate Community. Benthic invertebrate community structure and function will be measured at stream locations on upper and lower Rainy Creek, Carney Creek and Fleetwood Creek. Benthic invertebrate samples will be collected at the same locations as sediment and surface water samples. Samples will be collected according to an established EPA *Rapid Bioassessment Protocol* (RBP) (USEPA, 2003). For each sampling location, a number of alternative metrics of benthic community status will be calculated and combined to yield a Biological Condition Score. A number of alternative measures of habitat quality will also be measured to yield a Habitat Quality Score (a comparison of the Biological Condition Score to the Habitat Quality Score provides information on the likely contribution of non-habitat factors (e.g., chemical pollution) on the benthic community). The scores and individual metrics will be examined to identify if the community is impacted relative to reference and if there are any apparent trends in condition with asbestos concentrations. This method will require location of appropriate reference areas for comparison. The reference area(s) should match as closely as possible the habitat variables present at the aquatic sites being evaluated. As asbestos contamination may have been transported from the mine site area to upstream locations in Rainy Creek, upstream locations are not an appropriate reference.

Fish Community. Fish community will be assessed at all ponds and a sub-sample of the stream sampling locations using standard electrofishing techniques. Fish species and number (density) will be measured and compared to matched reference locations.

Tier 3: In-Situ Measures of Exposure and Effects

Dan...do you want to do TB and/or histo for fish and/or benthic organisms?

Comment [DW9]: Probably yes for fish.

Depending on the results of the assessment strategies above, it may also be valuable to examine organisms collected from the site and from reference areas to assess the level of exposure via measures of asbestos body burden and the level of effect via the frequency and severity of histological lesions.

Tissue Burden

INSERT

Gross and Microscopic Lesions

If this phase is deemed appropriate, fish will be collected from the field and examined for gross pathology, pathology effects and histological effects. Lesions that have been reported in the literature following exposure of aquatic organisms to asbestos are summarized in Table 6-xx. Incidence and severity of effects observed will be compared to a reference area as well as to the relative concentrations of asbestos in surface water and sediment at the sampling stations in an effort to establish a dose-response relationship. Consequences of the measured pathology effects will be evaluated based on literature information that associates the pathology effects with adverse effects on growth reproduction and survival. However, as seen in Attachment D, this evaluation of ecological consequences may be limited by the small number of samples available.

6.2.2 Strategy for Assessing Risks to Terrestrial Plants and Soil Invertebrates

Tier 1: Site-Specific Toxicity Testing

Comment [DW10]: Disturbed on-site soils will not be assessed. Only areas around the disturbed areas.

Available data demonstrate that on-site soils at the mined area are contaminated with LA. The first tier of assessment of risks to terrestrial plants and soil invertebrates will be site-specific toxicity testing of soils collected from within the Libby OU3 mine site area. This method will directly measure toxicity. Surface soil samples will be collected across a range of measured asbestos concentrations. Testing will be completed using standard laboratory test organisms using established protocols for chronic endpoints (growth, reproduction and survival). The design of toxicity testing would also need to consider other factors in on-site soils that may influence toxicity to plants and soil invertebrates. The disturbed soils and mine wastes may not

support plant life or soil invertebrate communities due to a lack of organic carbon and nutrients. These considerations may involve testing of field collected soils using amendments of nutrients and organic matter. The results of the testing will be used to derive site-specific toxicity values for plants and soils invertebrates for LA.

Tier 2: Site-Specific Population and Community Demographic Observations

Depending on the results of the site-specific toxicity testing for plants and soil invertebrates, site-specific surveys of density and diversity may also be valuable.

For soil invertebrates, methods for measurement of community demographic information are not very well established, and the results are often difficult to interpret, especially for US western soils [add references]. Therefore, it is considered likely that this assessment tier will not be implemented for soil invertebrates.

In contrast methods are well established for assessment of the density and diversity of plant communities, and this option may be useful. However, because the mined area has been heavily disturbed in the past, surveys of current plant status may be of only limited utility.

6.2.3 Strategy for Assessing Risks to Terrestrial Birds and Mammals

Asbestos is found in soils across the mine site area, as well as in the surface waters and sediments of the Rainy Creek drainage. Although data from Phase I are not yet available, it is considered likely that asbestos also contaminates trees and soils in forested areas for some distance away from the mine site.

Exposures for wildlife species are expected for each of these media via ingestion. Wildlife may also be exposed via inhalation to soils, sediments that have dried and also fibers deposited on foliar surfaces and trees. The extent of inhalation exposures; however, are based on activities that disturb the deposited asbestos and result in emissions into the air. Activities by wildlife that may result in disturbance include foraging on the ground, nesting on the ground, burrowing, and foraging in trees and foliage.

Conceptually, risks from asbestos could be evaluated by site-specific toxicity testing of appropriate species by both oral and inhalation exposure. However, performing such tests, especially inhalation tests, is technically very difficult, requires a long period of time, and is very expensive. Moreover, even if this were done and site-specific TRVs were established for oral and inhaled doses, the on-site level of exposure of various birds and mammals by each exposure route are not known and would be very difficult to estimate from measured levels of asbestos in soil and other media. Hence, it would be very difficult to use the results to derive meaningful

estimates of risks from LA to wild life. For these reasons, site-specific toxicity testing is not considered useful as the first tier of assessment for birds and mammals at this site.

Population surveys are an alternative assessment approach for assessing risks to birds and mammals, but these are also very difficult to perform because of the high spatial and temporal variability in population density and diversity, and because of the strong influence of density and diversity on habitat parameters. For these reasons, it is expected that reliable results from this approach would not be obtained until many years of surveys were completed. Based on this, population surveys are not considered useful as the first tier of assessment for birds and mammals at this site.

Tier 1: Biomarkers of Exposure and Effect

Having eliminated these two assessment techniques as being unlikely to be useful, the only assessment technique that remains is the measurement of biomarkers of exposure and effect in organisms collected from the site. This technique has the advantage that it allows an assessment of exposure and effects by both oral and inhalation exposures, and may allow development of maps that indicated the relative levels of exposure as a function of location. The chief disadvantage of this method is that biomarkers of exposure and effect are not easy to extrapolate to effects on growth, reproduction and survival, and hence on population stability.

Indicator Species

In order to implement this approach, it is first necessary to identify the classes of wildlife that are likely to be maximally exposed. The most important selection criteria include the following:

- Non-transitory. Some organisms migrate over long distances, and are present in the area of the site for only a short time each year. Because of the brief interval they would be exposed, such organisms would have less exposure than organisms that are present year round or for most of the breeding season.
- Small home range. Organisms that have a large home range are likely to spend on a small part of their time in and about the most heavily impacted areas of the site. Consequently, they are likely to be less exposed than organisms that have a small home range and spend a high fraction of their time in and about the impacted areas.

In addition to these two baseline factors, there are a number of other factors that may also influence the relative level of exposure, including the following:

- Foraging strategy – Species that forage on the ground and have a greater potential to disturb asbestos fibers are expected to be more inhalation exposed than those that forage in

shrubs or tree foliage. Species that feed in flight on insects and carnivores that prey on other mammals and birds are expected to be less exposed. Species that forage on aquatic organisms and fish would also be less exposed because inhalation exposures require the disturbance of fibers which is less likely under wet conditions.

- Habitats and Nesting – Where species find shelter, give birth (or nest) and/or rear young may also influence exposures. Many species burrow into the ground or create shallow runs under forest litter. Some others will create nests/dens in existing cavities of barren rock or dead trees. Burrowers are expected to receive higher exposures compared to those species that live higher in trees.
- Body Size – Ingestion rates and breathing rates per unit body weight tend to be higher for species with small body weights compared to species with higher body weights. Thus, exposure by both oral and ingestion pathways is likely to be highest for small receptors.
- Longevity In humans, it is well established that risk of adverse effects is a function of cumulative exposure. That is, risk depend both on exposure level and also on exposure duration. For this reason, it might be true that organisms that have longer life spans will tend to have higher cumulative exposures and hence would be at greatest risk. However, the time course of the development of toxic effects in animals is often in proportion to their life span (e.g., cancer can occur in 12-18 months in mice, while the same cancer requires 30-70 years to develop in humans). Thus, the importance of longevity is less certain than the other criteria described above.

Taking these factors into account, the feeding guilds and species identified as residing within the area of Libby OU3 (listed in Attachment A) were evaluated in order to identify a list of receptors most likely to have high exposures to LA, as follows:

- 1) Species inhabiting terrestrial and riparian habitats were segregated into two groups based on habitat type (terrestrial and riparian).
- 2) As exposures to asbestos for species inhabiting riparian habitats are primarily related to ingestion of aquatic food items as well as surface water and sediments, the riparian species were segregated into two exposure groups by feeding guild. These include aquatic invertivores/omnivores and piscivores.
- 3) For species that inhabit terrestrial habitats, those that forage on the ground and or inhabit nests or burrows were identified from the larger list and classified into a “ground” foraging group. These species are expected to be the highest exposed to asbestos via inhalation and ingestion as a result of probing and disturbing asbestos in soils and ground litter.

- 4) Species that forage primarily in trees and shrubs were identified from the larger list and classified as an “arboreal” foraging group. These species may be exposed to asbestos on tree bark or leaf surfaces as result of foraging for food.
- 5) Carnivorous species were identified and placed in separate group based on feed guild. These species are expected to be exposed to asbestos primarily via ingestion and inhalation exposures are expected to be lower than those species that forage on the ground for food.
- 6) The ground and arboreal groups were further stratified into feeding guilds (invertivore, grainivore, omnivore, carnivore) to reflect exposures related to ingestion.
- 7) The species in each group were then reviewed further and those with small home ranges and body sizes were selected preferentially. These species are expected to be maximally exposed to asbestos impacted area and will not range in and out of the area. Potential exposures and risks for the larger animal species will be considered at a later time based on the results for the smaller more exposed species.
- 8) For avian species, birds that are year round residents (non-migrants) were selected.

Table 4-12 provides the list of exposed species groups along with representative species. Risks will be assessed for these groups which are representative of the wildlife species (mammals and birds) within the Libby OU3 site that are most exposed to asbestos via both inhalation and ingestion.

Asbestos Tissue Burdens

Asbestos tissue burdens in selected organs (lungs and gastrointestinal tract) will be analyzed for asbestos tissue burdens. Based on what is known concerning the uptake and elimination of asbestos fibers via inhalation asbestos fibers can become imbedded in lung tissue. Ingestion exposures may result in accumulation of fibers in the gastrointestinal tract. Asbestos measurements in the tissues of mammals collected for the Libby OU3 site will be used to identify if mammalian receptors are exposed to asbestos. If exposures are identified, the histological examination of tissues will be completed. This information taken together will allow evaluation of exposure versus effects. The measured asbestos tissue levels will also be used a measure dietary exposure for carnivorous species in the evaluation of risks associated with ingestion exposures (calculation of HQs).

Histopathology

Asbestos exposures in mammals are known to be associated with certain pathology effects. A large number of studies have been performed in mammals to identify the effects of asbestos on the respiratory tract, and to a lesser degree on other organs (e.g. gastrointestinal tract). In animals, histological signs of tissue injury can be detected at the site of deposited fibers within a few days (ATSDR 2001). Ingestion exposures have been associated with lesions in the

parathyroid tissue, brain tissue, pituitary tissue, endothelial tissue, kidney tissue, and peritoneum tissue (Cunningham et al., 1977). Induction of aberrant crypt foci in the colon (Corpet et al., 1983) and tumors of the gastrointestinal tract have also been reported. Inhalation exposures are associated with fibrosis, lung tumors and lesions along the respiratory bronchioles, alveolar ducts, alveoli, and lung tissue (McGavran et al. 1989; Donaldson et al. 1988; Davis et al., 1980a, 1980b, 1985, 1986). Mesotheliomas have been observed (Davis and Jones 1988, Davis et al. 1985, Wagner et al. 1974, 1980, Webster et al. 1993). The histopathology of asbestos exposures in avian species is not known.

Collected mammals will be examined for gross pathology, pathology effects and histological effects. Incidence and severity of effects observed will be compared to a reference area as well as to the relative concentrations of asbestos in soil. Consequences of the measured pathology effects will be evaluated based on literature information that associates the pathology effects with adverse effects on growth reproduction and survival. Evaluation of the consequences of measured histopathology effects may not be possible and the results will be interpreted qualitatively.

Tier 2: Population and Community Demographic Observations

Demographic information on small mammals will be collected at the same time of sampling for asbestos tissue burden and histopathology. For each trap, species collected will be identified and the total number of individuals collected for each species will be recorded. This snapshot of the mammalian community will provide some information on the density of mammalian species that will be compared to the reference area.

6.2.4 Strategy for Assessing Risks to Amphibians

The first measurement endpoint (line of evidence) for amphibians will be site-specific toxicity testing of surface water. Surface water samples will be collected and amphibians will be exposed in the laboratory. The Frog Embryo Teratogenesis Assay (FETAX) is a 4-day, whole embryo-larval developmental toxicity screening assay which is used to monitor acute, chronic, developmental, and behavioral toxicity.

Comment [DW11]: This test should probably be extended longer than the 4 days. I don't know how long or what endpoints should be evaluated. It was my understanding that wildlife and amphibian experts were supposed to be consulted.

Population and Community Demographic Observations

The second measurement endpoint (line of evidence) identified for amphibians will be community surveys. Amphibians will be surveyed in the aquatic habitats (ponds) within the OU3 impacted area for abnormalities. There are standardized methods for completing these surveys. The information from the OU3 impacted area will be compared to surveys completed at reference locations.

7.0 REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.R., E.E. Hardy, J. T. Roach, and R. E. Witmer. 1976. *A Land Use And Land Cover Classification System For Use With Remote Sensor Data*. Geological Survey Professional Paper 964. U.S. Geological Survey, Washington DC.
- Asbestos Hazardous Emergency Response Act (AHERA). 1986. Title 20, Chapter 52, Sec. 4011. Public Law 99-519.
- Amandus HIE., and R. Wheeler. 1987. The Morbidity and Mortality of Vermiculite Miners and Millers Exposed to Tremolite-Actinolite: Part II. Mortality. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* 11:15-26.
- Belanger, S. E., Cherry, D. S., and Cairns, J. Jr. 1990. functional and pathological impairment of japanese medaka (*Oryzias latipes*) by long-term asbestos exposure. *Aquatic Toxicol.* 17(2): 133-54.
- Belanger, S. E. D. S. Cherry et al. 1986. uptake of chrysotile asbestos fibers alters growth and reproduction of asiatic clams.” *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences.* 43: 43-52.
- Belanger, Scott E., Cherry, Donald S., and Cairns, John. 1986. seasonal, behavioral and growth changes of juvenile *Corbicula fluminea* exposed to chrysotile asbestos. *Water Research.* 20(10): 1243-1250.
- Caicco, S. L., J. M. Scott, B. Butterfield, and B. Csuti. 1995. A gap analysis of management status of the vegetation of Idaho (USA). *Conservation Biology.* 9: 498-511.
- Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc. (CDM). 2002. *Final Sampling and Analysis Plan for the Remedial Investigation of Contaminant Screening Study (CSS), Libby Asbestos Site, Operable Unit 4*. April 2002.
- Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc. (CDM). 2003. *Final Sampling and Analysis Plan, Remedial Investigation, Libby Asbestos Site OU4*. May 2003.
- CARB 435. California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board, Method 435, Determination of Asbestos Content in Serpentine Aggregate. June 6, 1991.
- Cunningham, H. M., Moodie, C. A., Lawrence, G. A., and Pontefract, R. D. 1977. chronic effects of ingested asbestos in rats. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol.* 6(4): 507-13

Donham, K. J., Will, L. A., Denman, D., and Leininger, J. R. 1984. the combined effects of asbestos ingestion and localized x-irradiation of the colon in rats. *J. Environ Pathol Toxicol Oncol.* 5(4-5): 299-308.

Eijsackers, 1994

Haque, A. K., Ali, I., Vrazel, D. M., and Uchida, T. . 2001, Jan 12. chrysotile asbestos fibers detected in the newborn pups following gavage feeding of pregnant mice. *J. Toxicol Environ Health A.* 62(1): 23-31.

Hesterberg, T. W., Axten, C., McConnell, E. E., Oberdörster, G., Everitt, J., Müller, W. C., Chevalier, J., Chase, G. R., and Thevenaz, P. 1997. Chronic inhalation study of fiber glass and amosite asbestos in hamsters: twelve-month preliminary results. *Environ Health Perspect.* 105 Suppl. 5:1223-9.

McDonald J.C., J. Harris and B. Armstrong. 2004. Mortality in a cohort of vermiculite miners exposed to fibrous Amphibole in Libby, Montana. *Occup. Environ. Med.* 61:363-366.

McDonald J.C., A.D. McDonald, B. Armstrong, and P. Sebastien. 1986. Cohort study of mortality of vermiculite miners exposed to tremolite. *Brit. J. Ind. Med.* 43:436-444.

Meek, M. E. 1983. transmigration of ingested asbestos. *Environmental Health Perspectives.* Smith, W. E., Hubert, D. D., Sobel, H. J., Peters, E. T., and Doerfler, T. E. 1980. health of experimental animals drinking water with and without amosite asbestos and other mineral particles. *J. Environ Pathol Toxicol.* 3(5-6): 277-300.

Meeker, G.P., A.M. Bern, I.K. Brownfield, H.A. Lowers, S.J. Sutley, T.M. Hoeffen, and J.S. Vance. 2003. The Composition and Morphology of Amphiboles from the Rainy Creek Complex, Near Libby, Montana. *American Mineralogist.* 88: 1955-1969.

Menzie, C., N. Bettinger, A. Fritz, L. Kapustka, H. Regan, V. Moller and H. Noel. 2008. Population Protection Goals. In: *Population-Level Ecological Risk Assessment.* Barnthouse, L.W. (Ed). Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC) Press. Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks (MFWP). 2000. *Montana Forest Legacy Program Assessment of Need.* February 29, 2000.

Merrill, E. H., T. W. Kohley, M. E. Herdendorf, W. A. Reiners, K. L. Driese, R. W. Marrs, and S. H. Anderson. 1996. *The Wyoming Gap Analysis Final Report.* Unpublished report, Wyoming Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, University of Wyoming, Laramie.

- Parker, B.K. and T. J. Hudson. 1992. *Engineering Analysis of Flood routing Alternatives for the W. R. Grace Vermiculite Tailings Impoundment*. Submitted by Schafer and Associates, Bozeman Montana to the State of Montana Department of State Lands, Helena, MT.
- Peacock, P. R. and Peacock, A. 1965. asbestos-induced tumors in white leghorn fowls. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 132(1): 501-6.
- Peipins, L.A., M. Lewin, S. Campolucci, J. A. Lybarger, A. Miller, and D. Middleton. 2003. Radiographic abnormalities and exposure to asbestos-contaminated vermiculite in the community of Libby, Montana, USA. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 111:1753-1759.
- Quivik, L.F., 2002. Expert Report. United States v. W.R. Grace Civil Action No.90-11-2-07106/2. July 29, 2002.
- Schafer and Associates, 1992a. *Engineering Analysis of Flood Routing Alternatives for the W.R. Grace Vermiculite Tailings Impoundment*. March 1992.
- Schreier, H. and Timmenga, H. J. 1986. Earthworm response to asbestos-rich serpentinitic sediments. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry.* 18(1): 85-89.
- Shafer and Associates, 1992b. W.R. Grace Vermiculite Mine Closure Water Quality Data Report No. 1. November 1991. March 4, 1992.
- Shafer and Associates, 1992c. W.R. Grace Vermiculite Mine Closure Water Quality Data Report No. 2. March 1991. May 6, 1992.
- Shafer and Associates, 1992d. W.R. Grace Vermiculite Mine Closure Water Quality Data Report No. 3. July 1992. November 6, 1992.
- Shafer and Associates, 1993. W.R. Grace Vermiculite Mine Closure Water Quality Data Report No. 4. October 1992. January 13, 1993.
- Shafer and Associates, 1994. W.R. Grace Vermiculite Mine Closure Water Quality Data Report No. 5. October 1993. January 27, 1994.
- Shafer and Associates, 1995. W.R. Grace Vermiculite Mine Closure Water Quality Data Report No. 6. September 1994. February 3, 1995.
- Stewart, S. and K. Schurr. 1980. Effects of Asbestos on Artemia. In: *The Brine Shrimp Artemia. Vol 1: Morphology, Genetics, Radiobiology, Toxicology.* 345.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2008. *Phase II Sampling and Analysis Plan For Operable Unit 3, Libby Asbestos Superfund Site Part A: Surface Water and Sediment* (USEPA, 2008). Prepared by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 8, Denver, CO by Syracuse Research Corporation and Newfields.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2007. *Phase I Sampling and Analysis Plan For Operable Unit 3 Libby Asbestos Superfund Site*.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2006. *Guidance on Systematic Planning Using the Data Quality Objectives Process – EPA QA/G4*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Information. EPA/240/B-06/001. February 2006.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2005. *Supplemental Remedial Investigation Quality Assurance Project Plan (SQAPP) for Libby, Montana*. June 24, 2005.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2003. *Generic Ecological Assessment Endpoints (GEAE) for Ecological Risk Assessment*. Risk Assessment Forum. Washington DC, USEPA/630/P-02/004F.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2002. *Role of Background in the CERCLA Cleanup Program*. U.S. EPA Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, April 26, 2002. OSWER 9285.6-07P.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2000. *Sampling and Quality Assurance Project Plan, Revision 1 for Libby, Montana, Environmental Monitoring for Asbestos, Baseline Monitoring for Source Area and Residential Exposure to Tremolite-Actinolite Asbestos fibers*. January 2000.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1999. *Issuance of Final Guidance: Ecological Risk Assessment and Risk Management Principles for Superfund Sites*. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response Directive. Washington DC, USEPA-9285-7-28-P.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1998. *Guidelines for Ecological Risk Assessment*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA/630/R-95/002F.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1997. *Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Process for Designing and Conducting Ecological Risk Assessments*. Interim Final. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Response Team, Edison, NJ.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service Region 1 (USDAFSR1). 2008.
<http://www.fs.fed.us/r1/kootenai/resources/plants/graphs.shtml>.

W.R. Grace, 2006. Letter from Robert R. Marriam, Remedium, to Bonnie Lavelle, EPA dated August 2006.

Zinner E,R. 1982. *Geohydrology of the Rainy Creek Igneous Complex Near Libby Montana*. Masters Thesis Univeristy of Reno, Nevada. June 1982.

Zucker, G. 2006. Expert Report Prepared for W.R. Grace Company. Provided by Robert Marriam, Remedium correspondence to Bonita Lavelle, EPA, October 24, 2006.

TABLES

FIGURES

ATTACHMENT A
SPECIES INFORMATION

